

**REMARKS**

The Examiner is thanked for the comments in the Office Action (OA). They have helped considerably in understanding the rationale therein and in drafting this Response thereto.

5

**Item 1 (Drawings):**

The Examiner is thanked for noting the informality of the drawings. Applicant will submit appropriate formal drawings upon receipt of a Notice of Allowance.

10

**Item 2 (§ 102(a, b) rejection of claims 1-15):**

It is contended that claims 1-15 are anticipated by Continuous Software Corporations product Continuous (TM) released in 1997. Respectfully, this is error.

15

Specifically, it is asserted that element (a) is read on by the Continuous/CM Live ! From Planning to Production (referred to as LIVE) section of the document provided. Element "a" of claim 1 recites managing information in a development architecture framework. Management of such information includes ensuring that the project's knowledge capital and information resources are managed effectively so that integrity, accessibility, and quality and consistency are ensured.

20

Information management also includes managing the resources of other management processes.

Note the instant specification starting on page 22. LIVE, however, recites commands used to manage a project structure. Managing the project structure, as recited by LIVE, entails

25

subproject migration and creating project hierarchies. Nowhere in managing the project structure does LIVE address access to information, or quality and consistency of the information.

Furthermore, LIVE does not address managing the resources of other management processes, such as managing the resources for a repository, as in Applicant's invention.

30

Element "b" of claim 1 recites handling security of the development architecture framework by defining security requirements and auditing the development architecture framework to ensure that the security requirements are met. LIVE merely recites that security and access control are

stored on a development model on a per-database basis. Nowhere in the security section are security requirements defined nor is anything related to auditing, to ensure that these requirements are met, mentioned.

- 5 Element "c" of claim 1 recites ensuring quality of the project being carried out by the development architecture framework by obtaining measurements relating to predetermined criterion of the project. Measurements are taken utilizing metrics. These measurements are associated with an objective quality rating of a system. The quality rating relates to both process and product. Note the instant specification starting on page 114. LIVE fails to recite obtaining  
10 measurements of any type or an objective quality rating of a system.

- Further recited in element "c" of claim 1 is statistically analyzing the measurements. The analysis of these measurements reveals display trends. Note the instant specification starting on page 115. Continuus/PT Problem Tracking Task Reference (referred to as PT) generates a report  
15 on the problems associated with the product. The report includes, among other things, a problem number, product name, and a problem synopsis. The report is merely a summary of inputs by the user. Nowhere in this section is it suggested that these inputs are analyzed.

- Also recited in element "c" of claim 1 is training personnel based on the statistical analysis in  
20 order to improve the quality of the project. Because no statistical analysis is performed by PT or LIVE, there can be no training of personnel based on the statistical analysis.

- Element "d" of claim 1 recites managing the project being carried out by the development architecture framework by generating a plan to carry out the project. LIVE recites customizing a development model by meeting the project's particular needs in advance and/or allowing for  
25 adjustments while the project is underway. While adjusting the model while the project is underway teaches away from generating a plan to carry out the project, meeting the project's particular needs in advance, applicant may agree, reads on this portion of element "d" of claim 1. However, a model does not necessarily constitute a plan to carry out the project. Rather, a model  
30 meets needs of the project that arise while the project is being carried out. Thus, a model is not a true plan.

Further recited in element “d” of claim 1 is scheduling a timeline for executing the plan. PT recites assignment information including an estimated completion date and estimated duration of task. For the sake of argument, Applicant may agree that this reads on this portion of element “d” of claim 1. However, a timeline indicates an axis where points on the axis represent milestones in the plan. The estimated completion date and estimated duration of task merely represent a point at the end of the axis. Thus, PT fails to recite a true timeline.

Also claimed in element “d” of claim 1 is tracking the execution of the plan. The status of the original plan and schedule are tracked. PT recites an estimated completion date and an estimated duration of a task. Merely reciting these dates does not allow for status updates associated with a plan.

In addition, reporting information uncovered during tracking is recited in element “d” of claim 1.

PT recites an update and modify feature, which reveals the actual completion and the actual resource. The update / modify feature merely allows the user to edit basic information in boxes that are defaulted as read only. PT does not report a summarization of information related to tracking.

Element “e” of claim 1 recites governing an environment in which the project is carried out by the development architecture framework. PT merely recites viewing information about a problem. PT fails to teach or reasonably suggest governing the environment in which the project is carried out.

Element “f” of claim 1 recites coordinating delivery of components of the project in a selected order. PT fails to discuss delivery of components of a project. Rather, PT merely discusses viewing and assigning a problem related to a project.

Element “g” of claim 1 recites rectifying problems that occur during delivery of the components of the project. The Examiner has cited PT, page 179, Assign Problem above. Applicant understands this to refer to page 197 cited above, under Problem assignment, in element “e.”

G

While PT discusses information written into a box describing work that must be done to resolve a problem number, it fails to teach or reasonably suggest actually rectifying problems that occur during the delivery of components of the project.

- 5 Element "h" of claim 1 recites maintaining updated support information during the delivery of the components of the project. The Examiner cites the rejection of this element "as per Problem Support above." A Problem Support section is referenced nowhere else in the office action. To the extent that the Applicant understands this rejection to be based on Problem assignment, PT merely recites modifying information in the text boxes. However, nothing in the section cited by  
10 the Examiner indicates that modifications are made to maintain updated support information.

- Claims 8 and 15 contain similar limitations as claim 1 and are therefore believed allowable over the references of record for the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1. Claims 2-7 and 9-14 depend from claims 1 and 8 respectively, and therefore include the limitations thereof  
15 and are believed to be allowable over the references of record.

New claims 16-20 have been included to further clarify and define the scope of Applicant's invention. No new subject matter had been introduced by these new claims.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reexamination of claims 1 through 15,  
5 and submits that these claims are in condition for allowance. In addition, Applicant respectfully  
requests consideration of new claims 16-20. Accordingly, a notice of allowance is respectfully  
requested.

10

Hickman Coleman & Hughes, LLP  
P.O. Box 52037  
Palo Alto, California 94303

15

Telephone: 408.558.9950  
Facsimile: 408.558.9960

20

Respectfully Submitted,

Raymond E. Roberts  
Registration No. 38,597

RECEIVED  
SEP - 7 2000  
TC 2700 MAIL ROOM

4